

IV. REMARKS

1. The specification is amended to include section headings. The Abstract is amended.

Claims 1, 3, 4-6, 8-15 and 17-21 are amended.

Claims 2, 7 and 16 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 22 and 23 are new.

2. The claims are amended to address the noted antecedent basis errors.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-18 are not anticipated by Picard et al. ("Picard") (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,318) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim 1 recites means for arranging an at least partly simultaneous connection between the terminal and the email server maintaining the first remote mailbox.

The paragraph cited by the Examiner (Col. 5, lines 13 to 21) does not deal with a simultaneous connection to two locations, but rather to making a copy (MIRROR) of the locations in the VMS device 106, or making a link which is not even updated when the message comes in but it must be refreshed (as the Examiner has noticed in his rejection against claim 3. However, this is not a browser controlling mailboxes but a browser controlling the VMS device).

As recited in claim 1, the terminal comprises means for controlling the remote mailboxes substantially simultaneously by means of the connections. In Picard, the terminal does not

control the connections simultaneously, but rather it sets up a connection with the VMS 106 device, logs in and the VMS 106 device lists all the messages from all mailboxes. When the Picard terminal is connected to the VMS device, it is not connected to all the messaging mailboxes and does not control them simultaneously. It is not possible for the terminal of Picard to set up a connection with both the email box 66 and the email box 66.1. Thus, at least these features of Applicant's invention are not disclosed or suggested by Picard. Claims 8, 15 and 18 are also not disclosed or suggested for similar reasons. Claims 3-6, 9-14, 17 and 19-21 should be allowable at least by reasons of their respective dependencies.

4. Claims 5-6, 12-13 and 19-20 are not unpatentable over Picard under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the reasons stated above.

5. Claims 7, 14 and 21 are not unpatentable over Picard and further in view of what the Examiner refers to as AAPA under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) at least for the above stated reasons.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$400 is enclosed for the additional independent claim fee (two extra). The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.



Respectfully submitted,

Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.

Reg. No. 44,004

12 JANUARY 2005
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800 Ext. 134
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 1/12/05

Signature: Doris W. Perman
Person Making Deposit